



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,583	10/26/2001	Brett A. Green	10013478-1	8143

7590                    02/27/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/005,583	GREEN, BRETT A.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach a method for scanning a document comprising "receiving a scan request from a user browser" (p.9, lines 12-13, p.11, lines 8-9). The Examiner disagrees because Kuwata teaches a server for scanning a document that is accessible through the network by PC's on a network utilizing a local Internet (p.2, para. 42). In other words, a user will access the server through a browser to request to scan or copy documents. Kuwata further teaches a user requesting to scan a document by selecting "scan" on the server (p.3, para. 47), which can also be accessed through a browser (p.2, para. 42).

Applicants further argue that Kuwata does not teach "receiving selections made with the user browser" (p.11, lines 13-14). The Examiner disagrees because Kuwata teaches a server with capability for a user selecting a scan option and receiving changes in scan job preferences made by the user (p.3, para. 47). Kuwata further teaches the server being accessible through the network by PC's on a network utilizing a local Internet (p.2, para. 42). In other words, a user will make selections on the server through a browser.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach uploading content to a user browser in the form of "at least one control screen" (p.12, lines 2-3). The Examiner disagrees because Kuwata teaches uploading content to the browser including a control screen (p.3, para. 47, 53) since Kuwata teaches the user using a browser to manage and edit scanned documents that are uploaded to the browser. Kuwata further teaches an Administrator managing all files, folders and users through the browser. In other words, the user is presented with a control screen for managing documents and the Administrator is presented with a control screen for managing the system.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach uploading content to a user browser comprising "at least one application that is configured to perform a designated task on a computing device" (p.12, lines 5-7). The Examiner disagrees because Kuwata teaches uploading content to the browser including an application that is configured to perform a designated task (p.3, para. 53) since Kuwata teaches an Administrator managing all files, folders and users through the browser. In other words, the Administrator is presented with a control screen for performing the designated tasks of managing storage and users.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach that the "receiving, uploading, and scanning" of claim 1 are performed by a "scanning device" (p.12, lines 8-9). The Examiner disagrees because Kuwata teaches the server as a scanning device that is capable of receiving selections, uploading content and scanning documents (p.3, para. 47).

Regarding independent claim 9, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach "means for receiving a scan request from a user browser" or "means for receiving selections made with the user browser" (p.13, lines 1-2). The Examiner disagrees because independent claim 9 is rejected at least based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach "means of claim 9 are provided on a scanning device" (p.13, lines 5-6). The Examiner disagrees because dependent claim 22 is rejected at least based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 21 above.

Regarding independent claim 13, Applicants argue that Kuwata does not teach "logic configured to receive a scan request from a user browser" or "logic configured to receive selections made with the user browser" (p.13, lines 17-19). The Examiner disagrees because independent claim 13 is rejected at least based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

Regarding dependent claims 15 and 23, Applicants refer back to the discussions of claims 3 and 21 (p.13, lines 21-22). The Examiner refers to the rejections of claims 3 and 21 above since the dependent claims 15 and 23 are rejected at least based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 3 and 21 above.

Dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16 depend on independent claims 1, 9 and 13 and are rejected at least based on the rejections above.

Regarding claims 17-20 and 24, Applicants argue that Kuwata and Dance do not teach explicit limitations of Applicant's claims and Somashekhar does not remedy the deficiencies (p.15, lines 4-9). The Examiner disagrees because independent claim 17 recites similar limitations to independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2 and is rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above. Dependent claims 18-20 and 24 depend on independent claim 17 and are rejected at least based on the rejection above.



CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER